DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 021 HE 014 697

AUTHOR Kayla, Carol A.; And Others
TITLE Student Evaluation of Graduate Programs in Selected Southern Universities.
INSTITUTION West Virginia Univ., Morgantown. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE Oct 81
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Joint Conference of the Southern Association for Institutional Research and the North Carolina Association for Institutional Research (Charlotte, NC, October 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Alumni; Curriculum Evaluation; Departments; *Evaluation Methods; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; *Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Institutional Research; Participant Satisfaction; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; School Surveys; Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Student Reaction
IDENTIFIERS Exit Interviews; *United States (South)

ABSTRACT

Current procedures for student evaluation of graduate programs are examined, based on three studies, and a valid measure for collecting graduate student evaluations is proposed. Study one surveyed 23 southern universities to determine the number and type of evaluations conducted. Only seven (30 percent) of the institutions conduct graduate student exit surveys or alumni surveys. Survey results are used for different purposes in each institution, including program review, self-study/accreditation, and information for the Graduate Assembly. The second study surveyed 69 graduate departments at West Virginia University. Some type of formal survey and/or interview to evaluate graduate programs is conducted by 41 departments of the university, 39 (48 percent) indicated that they do not conduct any formal type of graduate evaluation. Survey results are used for degree program and curriculum review, for department review, and self-study. A few departments use the results for faculty review. In the third study, the Graduate Student Program Evaluation test was constructed and tested. Factor analysis reduced the test to 32 items with high internal reliability. The instrument was tested with 99 graduating master's and doctoral students. The results suggest that graduate students' evaluations of their programs are unidimensional in nature, indicating that all areas of the program are considered an integral part of the whole experience. The survey instrument is appended. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

# West Virginia University

## Office of Institutional Research

# STUDENT EVALUATION OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN SELECTED SOUTHERN UNIVERSITIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it. Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Carol A. Kayla
Virginia Eman Wheeless
Richard D. Howard

Office of Institutional Research
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE TM

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED211021

## Abstract

The purpose of this investigation was to examine current student evaluation procedures of graduate programs and to propose a valid measure for collecting graduate student evaluations. Results from three studies are reported. Study I surveyed 25 Southern universities to determine how many and the type of evaluations conducted. Study II surveyed graduate departments at one comprehensive university to determine the types of evaluations conducted by various departments. Study III designed the Graduate Student Program Evaluation instrument. Results of a survey of 99 graduating master's and doctoral students proposed a refined GSPE instrument as a valid and reliable measure of graduate students' evaluation of degree programs.

Presented at the Southern Association for Institutional Research Convention
Charlotte, N. C., 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol A. Kayla

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 014 697

## STUDENT EVALUATION OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN SELECTED SOUTHERN UNIVERSITIES

Economic issues and increased accountability in education have increased the demand for higher education program review (Harcleroad, 1980). Economic problems and declining enrollments in United States colleges and universities, along with student and societal demands for a more relevant education in a rapidly changing job market have applied substantial pressures on higher education institutions to improve their quality of service. Program reviews can help determine a school's program quality or weaknesses and provide a means to show support for a program's continuation, enlargement, or termination (Dressel, 1976). Currently, the majority of the data collected for program reviews are concerned with headcount enrollments, FTEs, cost of programs and number of degrees awarded. Although the need for such information is unquestionable, further subjective evaluations by faculty and students would provide valuable sources of data for program evaluation.

Graduate and professional schools are generally the most expensive university programs (McBath, 1979) and are often the programs which are eliminated first in times of strained budgets. For purposes of future planning decisions and improvement of educational quality, it is essential to obtain as much evaluative data on these programs as is feasible. However, currently a void exists in numerous institutions in collecting student evaluations of graduate programs. The purpose of this investigation was to examine procedures of current student evaluation of graduate programs and to propose a valid measure for collecting graduate student evaluations.

### Review of Literature

The decade of the seventies saw an increase in an awareness that review of graduate programs was necessary. However, few universities have established mechanisms to collect a wide variety of evaluative data.

In 1973 the Educational Testing Service (ETS), under the supervision of the Graduate Record Examination Board and the Council of Graduate Schools (Clark, 1974), surveyed graduate deans' opinions on the importance of certain program characteristics in rating the quality of doctoral programs, and asked how to best measure these characteristics. The ten program characteristics graduate deans rated the highest in determining quality were as follows: 1) general academic ability of students entering the program; 2) achievements, knowledge, and/or skills of students at time of degree completion; 3) university financial support for the program; 4) library facilities; 5) academic training of faculty; 6) purposes of the program; 7) laboratory equipment and facilities; 8) course and other educational offerings; 9) admissions policies; and 10) provision for welfare of faculty members. Methods suggested to measure these ten characteristics included: judgments by recent graduates, visiting experts and faculty on the clarity of program purposes and plans as measures of the characteristics, purposes of the program, and faculty/student satisfaction

with courses and other offerings as measures of course and other educational offerings. The surveyed deans specifically noted that data on purposes of the program (#6 above) were not collected.

In 1976 the Educational Testing Service (ETS) conducted another study (Clark, 1976), financed by a National Science Foundation grant and sponsored by the Council of Graduate Schools. In the study the premise that multiple indicators were better in judging program quality than a single indicator was examined. Questionnaires were sent to doctoral students, recent alumni, and faculty of chemistry, history, and psychology departments in 25 universities. The results of the study indicated that perceptions and opinions of a variety of participants in a program were relatively inexpensive and easy to collect. Index scores were compiled and acceptable validity and reliability were reported.

Two clusters of evaluation characteristics emerged from this 1976 study. The first measured program size, faculty research, alumni success, quality of facilities, and students' academic ability. This cluster was found more often in institutions that produced more researchers and scholars than practitioners or teachers. The second cluster measured the perceptions of faculty, students, and recent graduates on the climate for learning, quality of teaching, and degree requirements. This cluster contained some of the same characteristics from the earlier 1973 study, but was generally overlooked by institutions in judging the quality of the program or department. However, it was recommended that one set of questionnaires could be used for all of three disciplines surveyed in the study and collection of data would be relatively inexpensive.

In 1977 the Educational Testing Service (ETS) (Clark, 1979) examined the definition of "program review" and the purposes of such review at 450 university departments. Two major purposes of review were discovered: "1) informing departmental and institutional decision-makers about a program's strengths and weaknesses as the first step in a process designed to improve quality, and 2) to establish a program's status relative to specific standards or in relation to the performance of other similar programs" (p. 1).

According to the ETS survey "50 to 70 percent of the department reviews included student evaluations of courses and teaching, judgment by faculty members and students concerning the departmental learning environment (such as intellectual climate, student/faculty relations, whether or not policies are administered fairly and equitably), and student judgment about their educational experiences (such as assistantships or internships, whether or not the program meets student needs, satisfaction with the academic offerings)" (Clark, 1979, p. 2). Also, three-fourths of the institutions responding felt that student opinions on teaching, followed by student and faculty opinions about the learning environment, satisfaction of students with educational experiences, satisfaction of faculty with their employment, graduate training opinions by alumni, and alumni career and job accomplishments were very important for decision-making at the department level. The majority of institutions used such information for internal department use, but not for outside accountability purposes.

Student satisfaction or opinion has been reported to be a valid measure in evaluating curriculum, faculty teaching, advisors, and departmental performance. According to Dressel (1976), in order to evaluate a curriculum, opinions should be sought from faculty, employers, and students entering and completing a program. Many problems and dissatisfactions can be discovered from questionnaires or interviews with graduating students. The results of other research (Costin, 1971) has suggested that students as the consumers of courses are the best subjective judges of the teaching performance criteria. A review of studies showed that students' ratings can provide valid and reliable information on the quality of teaching and courses which can be used to evaluate instruction and help faculty improve (Costin, 1971).

Bare (1980) identified eight academic departmental performance outcomes, of which the top three dealt with student satisfaction: 1) satisfaction with their overall learning experience, 2) satisfaction with faculty, and 3) satisfaction with academic advising. Students' attitudes have been identified as a "unique perspective that should not be overlooked in assessing quality" (Braskamp, 1979, p. 498), and as useful in making resource allocations, program changes, and policy decisions.

Some researchers, such as Overall (1980), have suggested that it was better to ask alumni to evaluate graduate programs because their opinions are those from people who are now employed and they can determine how adequate their curriculum was in preparing them for their present positions. However, several disadvantages to surveying alumni have been expressed. Dressel (1976) pointed out that since alumni have had a variety of experiences after leaving college, they may not be able to recall specific instructors or courses. They may remember instructors that were more "entertaining" and forget the "better" teachers. Alumni may also become more charitable in assigning ratings, not wanting to hurt others' feelings. Wood (1978) also cited problems with obtaining current addresses for alumni and associated mailing costs. Despite all of these disadvantages of alumni survey, Wise (1980) has demonstrated that alumni opinions and ratings were highly correlated with enrolled student ratings and ratings were not dependent on job related variables. Costin (1971) also noted that alumni and currently enrolled students generally agreed on the use of criteria to rate the instructor qualities. Thus, alumni evaluations do not provide significant additional information than do student evaluations and thus, are considered unnecessary at this point.

The above review indicates that student evaluation of graduate programs is highly recommended, but infrequently collected in a systematic manner. Therefore, the purpose of this investigation was to examine some currently used evaluations and propose a new evaluation measure. This study isolated one national region, Southern United States universities, and one institution, West Virginia University, to further analyze specific evaluation programs.

## STUDY I

### Method and Procedures

Twenty-five southern universities (members of SUG 25) were surveyed by mail to determine 1) which institutions asked exiting graduate students and/or

alumni to evaluate their respective graduate programs, and 2) the types of surveys or interviews conducted. Of the total 25 institutions surveyed, 23 institutions (92%) responded.

## Results

Only seven (30%) of those responding institutions indicated that they conducted graduate student exit surveys or alumni surveys. Three conducted alumni graduate surveys and four conducted graduate student exit surveys. Sixteen institutions indicated they did not conduct surveys or interviews of either graduate students or alumni.

Of the four institutions that indicated they conducted graduate student exit surveys, three said all graduating graduate students each semester were surveyed and one surveyed May graduates only. At three of the four institutions, a survey was distributed by the department conducting the survey or the Student Placement Office when the student applied for graduation or receipt of diploma. The other institution distributed the survey by mail after May graduation. The return rate for those surveys distributed directly by departments was approximately 85-90% at one institution. Those distributed by mail reported a 50% return rate.

Various university offices were involved in the development of the survey instrument for the seven responding institutions that indicated they conducted student or alumni surveys. Some of those offices listed were: Student Services, Student Affairs Planning and Research Office, Institutional Research, Library, and the Graduate College. The analysis of the graduate surveys were generally performed by the Student Placement Office, Career Planning, Student Affairs, Planning and Research Office, Graduate College, Deans, and Institutional Research. The results were used primarily for departmental review, but were also used to determine the quality of program review, placement of graduates, and general student attitude toward the university.

Three institutions indicated that alumni surveys were conducted. Alumni were defined as students who had been graduated up to five years prior to review. At one institution, advisors of alumni doctoral recipients were surveyed concerning employment of their students. Return rates for alumni surveys varied from 30-60%, with a 95% return rate from advisors. The instruments used were developed primarily by the various institutional Graduate Schools. Institutional Research and an evaluation committee also had input in the development of two of the surveys. Distribution of the survey at two institutions was through the Graduate School and at one through the Office of Institutional Research. Survey results were used for different purposes in each institution such as program review, self study/accreditation, information for the Graduate Assembly, and for general interest.

## STUDY II

## Methods and Procedures

Eighty-one West Virginia University graduate departments, offering a total of 75 master's and 29 doctoral programs, were surveyed by campus mail to

determine 1) which departments routinely asked exiting graduate students and/or alumni to evaluate their graduate programs, and 2) the type of surveys or interviews conducted. Of the total 81 departments surveyed, 69 departments (85%) responded. (See Table 1 for department and college indications of return.)

Results

Some type of formal survey and/or interview to evaluate graduate programs was conducted by 41 departments (51%) of the responding graduate departments. Surveys of exiting graduate students were conducted by eight departments and alumni surveys were conducted by 14 departments. Six departments indicated that they conducted formal graduate student exit interviews. Of the total 81 departments surveyed, 39 (48%) indicated that they did not conduct any formal type of graduate evaluation. Thirteen departments said they conducted "other" types of evaluations such as surveys of employers and informal exit interviews. Eight departments indicated that they conducted more than one type of evaluation. For example, the department of Rehabilitation Counseling said they surveyed exiting graduate students, graduate alumni and employers.

Graduate Student Exit Survey: Of the eight departments that indicated they conducted exit surveys, four said that all exiting graduate students were surveyed either by departmental mail or by advisor/faculty. Of those students surveyed in this manner 80-100% completed the evaluations. These surveys were developed by departmental staff/faculty and/or a graduate committee.

Analyses of results from departmental surveys were distributed primarily to the departmental chairperson and faculty. Two education departments reported the results to accreditation agencies and one reported them to federal and state education agencies. One department also noted the results were used in grant funding proposals. Results were primarily used for curriculum review (6 departments). Four departments used the results for program, department review, and self study. Only one department considered the results in faculty evaluation.

Alumni Graduate Surveys: Fourteen departments indicated that they conducted alumni surveys. Ten departments said they surveyed all alumni of selected classes for whom they had addresses. One department surveyed all graduates of their program within the last 25 years and another surveyed those of the last 10 years. Two departments chose random samples. Five departments had conducted one-time surveys two to eight years ago. Annual surveys were conducted by three departments. The rest of the departments indicated they surveyed alumni every three to five years. Alumni returns ranged from 20-100% depending on the size of the program's graduating class surveyed, the smaller the class, the higher percentage the return. Of the ten departments that reported return rates, six had 50% or less return rate.

Departments indicated that the survey results were primarily used for degree program and curriculum review. Eight departments used the results in self-study, and five used them for departmental review. Only two departments considered the results in faculty review. Two departments shared results with

their dean and one with the central administration. Three departments sent results to state and local education departments. Only one department sent results to an accreditation agency.

Graduate Student Exit Interviews: Formal exit interviews of graduate students were conducted by six departments. The exit interview in two departments was considered mandatory. The program chairperson, associate chairperson, and/or members of the graduate committee conducted the interviews. Results of the interviews were used primarily for degree program review.

Other Methods of Evaluation: Thirteen departments indicated they used other methods of evaluation instead of, or in addition to, graduate exit or alumni surveys. Employers or supervisors of past graduates were surveyed by five departments. Other types of surveys mentioned were surveys of current students, practicum students, cooperative teachers, undergraduate students, and executives in a particular field. Some departments mentioned personal contacts, informal exit interviews, oral problem report reviews, and students' regular input to the program as methods of evaluation.

Eight departments mentioned that their programs were so small that they had regular contact and input from their graduate students. Personal contact, even after graduation, was mentioned by four departments. Unstructured informal exit interviews during final exams or the student's oral defense were mentioned by six departments. Exit interviews of drop-out students were conducted in two departments. One department indicated graduate student input or evaluation of programs was obtained from a student representative on the program review committee. Other forms of input from alumni were from contacts at professional meetings or through newsletters. Four departments mentioned they had plans to conduct an exit or alumni survey in the future.

## STUDY III

The ultimate purpose of this investigation was to develop a valid and reliable instrument to evaluate graduate students' perceptions of degree programs. Several instruments have been proposed to measure student evaluations of degree programs (Levine & Weitz, 1968; Astin, 1970; Stern, 1970; Berdie, Pilapil, & Im, 1970; Anderson & Berdie, 1972; Henard, 1975; Bowen & Kilmann, 1975; Feild & Schoenfeldt, 1975; National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1977; "Following up Graduates. . ., 1977, Feild & Giles, 1980). A review of the instruments indicated that some measures were specific to a type of graduate student, e.g., MBA students, graduate assistants, etc. (Anderson & Berdie, 1972; Feild & Giles, 1980), and others measured only a part of the total graduate school experience, e. g., educational climate, job satisfaction, student employment, etc. (Berdie, et al., 1970; Stern, 1970; Levine & Weitz, 1968; Astin, 1970; Bowen & Kilman, 1975; Feild & Schoenfeldt, 1975; National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1977. Although these instruments offer significant insight into the measurement of student evaluations, no one instrument was considered a valid measure of a comprehensive graduate program evaluation. Therefore, in this investigation a new measure was designed and its reliability and validity tested.

## Instrument Development

The results of Study I and Study II produced several measures used by universities to measure graduate student evaluations of degree programs. These measures, along with those listed above, were reviewed and a list of 55 topics to be used for the evaluation of graduate programs was developed. This list of topics was then subdivided into the categories of curriculum, academic advising, administrative procedures, faculty and teaching, university facilities, and learning environment. A 48-item, self-report, Likert-type Graduate Student Program Evaluation (GSPE) instrument was developed to obtain graduate students' perceptions of these areas. For purposes of this instrument, some categories were combined resulting in nine items measuring curriculum, seven items measuring graduate advising, eleven items measuring facilities and administrative policies, fifteen items measuring graduate faculty, and five items measuring learning environment (See Table 3).

## Methods and Procedures

The Graduate Student Program Evaluation (GSPE) was distributed to 350 Summer, 1981 graduating master's and doctoral students at West Virginia University. The surveys were mailed to students along with a letter from the Dean of the Graduate School and a stamped return envelope. All responses were anonymous.

A cutoff date was set for October 2, 1981 for the preliminary analysis. 101 (29%) questionnaires were returned before that date. Two questionnaires were not fully completed and thus, were eliminated from further analysis, resulting in an $n$ of 99. The sample consisted of 49 females and 50 males, 19 doctoral graduates and 80 master's graduates, the average length of time to complete the degree was 32 months, and the average age was 29 years. Thirty-seven degree awarding departments were represented.

## Statistical Analysis

The 48-item GSPE was divided into the five determined categories (Curriculum, Graduate Advising, Facilities and Administrative Policies, Graduate Faculty, and Learning Environment). Item-total correlations were computed, by category, to determine if any items should be eliminated before further analysis. Those items with < .50 correlations were eliminated. The items were curriculum #8 and #9, facilities and administrative policies #2, #3, #8, #9, #10, and #11, and faculty #10 (See Table 3).

The remaining 39 items were then analyzed using a principal axis factor analysis with oblique rotation (Statistical Analysis System). An eigenvalue of 1.0 and the scree test were used as criteria for the number of factors to be extracted. Factors were required to have 2 items loading at .60 or above. Further, remaining items maintained on factors were required to have a primary factor loading of at least .40.

Internal reliabilities on each factor were computed using Nunnally's (1967) method.

## Results

The principal axis factor analysis with oblique rotation for 5 factors of the 39 items indicated that Factor 1 had an eigenvalue of 12.6618 accounting for 33.5% of the variance, the next Factor had an eigenvalue of 2.9983 and 7.9% variance, Factor 3 had an eigenvalue of 2.3696 and 6.2% variance, Factor 4 had an eigenvalue of 2.0400 with 4.7% variance and Factor 5 had an eigenvalue of 2.0400 with 4% variance. Only Factors 1 and 2 met the criterion of 2 or more items of .60 loading or above, thus, the data was submitted to a second factor analysis with oblique rotation calling for two factors. This analysis yielded only 1 factor which met the 2 or more items of .60 loading criterion. A final factor analysis was computed demonstrating that the GSPE instrument was a unidimensional measure (See Table 4 for unrotated factor pattern) accounting for 33.5% variance. This result is consistent with the scree test criterion. Based on the .40 loading criterion to retain an item, the following items were eliminated (See Table 3 for items): Facilities and Administrative Policies #4, #6, and #7; and Learning Environment #3, #4, and #5. The resulting GSPE contained 32 items with a .95 internal reliability (Nunnally, 1967).

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of this investigation was to examine current procedures in graduate student evaluations and propose a valid and reliable instrument to measure such evaluations. From a review of existing published and unpublished measures, the Graduate Student Program Evaluation test was constructed. Factor analysis helped to reduce the test to 32 items with high internal reliability.

Several cautions should be noted about this investigation. First, due to a low initial return, the above analyses used only 99 subjects. Factor analysis for a 48-item test actually calls for a conservative sample size of 200. Second, only 33.5% variance was accounted for by the GSPE. Before final adoption of this measure, we plan to add additional items to the test. These items will come from open-ended questions returned by the subjects concerning (1) what students best liked about their graduate studies at the university, (2) what they least liked, (3) what things should be kept in their graduate program, and (4) what things should be changed. With the inclusion of these items, the instrument would then be subjected to the analysis described above before its final form is adopted.

The investigation suggests that graduate students' evaluation of their programs are unidimensional in nature, indicating that all areas of the program are considered an integral part of whole experience. As such, it appears that if an institution is sincerely interested in obtaining students' perceptions of degree programs, then all such elements should be considered.

## REFERENCES

ANDERSON, J. F. & BERDIE, D. R. Graduate assistants at the University of Minnesota. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Measurement Services Center, 1972.

ASTIN, A. The methodology of research on college impact, part. Sociology of Education, 1970, 43, 437-450.

BARE, A. C. The study of academic department performance. Research in Higher Education, 1980, 12, 3-20.

BERDIE, R., PILAPIL, B., & IM, I. Entrance correlates of university satisfaction. American Educational Research Journal, 1970, 7, 251-266.

BOWEN, D. & KILMANN, R. Developing a comparative measure of the learning climate in professional schools. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 71-79.

BRASKAMP, L. A., WISE, S. L., & HENGSTER, D. Student satisfaction as a measure of departmental quality. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 491-498.

CLARK, M. J. Dimensions of quality in doctoral education. Findings-ETS, 1974, 1, 1-4.

CLARK, M. J. Multiple measures assess doctoral programs. Findings-ETS, 1976, 5, 1-4.

CLARK, M. J. A practical guide to graduate program review, Findings-ETS, 1979, 5, 1-4.

COSTIN, F., GREENOUGH, W. T., & MENGES, R. J. Student ratings of college teachings: Reliability, validity and usefulness. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41, 511-535.

DRESSEL, P. L. Handbook of academic evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

FEILD, H. & SCHOENFELDT, L. Development and application of a measure of students' college experiences. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 491-497.

FEILD, H. S. & GILES, W. F. Student satisfaction with graduate education: Dimensionality and assessment in a school of business. Educational Research Quarterly, 1980, 5, 66-73.

REFERENCES (continued)

Following up graduates - a measure of academic effectiveness. Regional Spotlight - Southern Regional Education Board, 1977, 11, 1-6.

HARCLEROAD, F. F. The context of academic program evaluation. New Directions for Institutional Research - Academic Program Evaluation, 1980, 7, 1-20.

HENARD, R. E. A study of graduates of the University of Colorado: 1890-1973. University of Colorado Academic Planning Office, 1975.

LEVINE, E. & WEITZ, J. Job satisfaction among graduate students: Intrinsic versus extrinsic variables. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 263-271.

MCBATH, J. H. Methods of assessing graduate programs in speech communication. Communication Education, 1979, 28, 359-361.

NUNNALLY, J. C. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

OVERALL, J. U. & MARSH, H. W. Students' evaluations of instruction: A longitudinal study of their stability. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1980, 72, 321-325.

STERN, G. People in context: Measuring person environment congruence in education and industry. New York: Wiley, 1970.

WISE, S. L., BRASKAMP, L. A., & HENGSTLER, D. D. Alumni ratings as an indicator of departmental quality. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, Boston, 1980.

WOOD, L. & DAVIS, B. G. Designing and evaluating higher education curricula. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report, #8, 1978. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1978.

TABLE 1

DEPARTMENTS SURVEYED AT WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY AND RATE OF RETURN

| College | Number of Graduates Departments | Number of Responses | Return Rate |
|---|---|---|---|
| College of Agriculture & Forestry | 17 | 16 | 94% |
| College of Arts & Sciences | 16 | 12 | 75% |
| College of Business & Economics | 4 | 3 | 75% |
| Creative Arts Center | 4 | 4 | 100% |
| School of Dentistry | 2 | 2 | 100% |
| School of Engineering | 8 | 7 | 88% |
| College of Human Resources & Education | 12 | 9 | 75% |
| School of Journalism | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| School of Medicine | 7 | 5 | 71% |
| College of Mineral & Energy Resources | 4 | 4 | 100% |
| School of Nursing | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| School of Pharmacy | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| School of Physical Education | 3 | 3 | 100% |
| School of Social Work | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| TOTAL | 81 | 69 | 85% |

TABLE 2

TYPE OF EVALUATION CONDUCTED BY COLLEGE*

| College | Graduate Exit Survey | Graduate Exit Interview | Alumni Survey | Other Eval. | No Eval. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| College of Agriculture & Forestry | | 1 | 2 | | 13 |
| College of Arts & Sciences | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| College of Business & Economics | | 2 | | | 1 |
| Creative Arts Center | | | | 1 | 2 |
| School of Dentistry | | | | 1 | 1 |
| School of Engineering | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| College of Human Resources & Education | 5 | | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| School of Journalism | | | | | 1 |
| School of Medicine | | 1 | 1 | | 3 |
| College of Mineral and Energy Resources | | | | 1 | 3 |
| School of Nursing | 1 | | 1 | 1 | |
| School of Pharmacy | | | | | 1 |
| School of Physical Education | | | | | 3 |
| School of Social Work | | | 1 | | |
| TOTAL | 8 | 6 | 14 | 13 | 39 |



*Some departments indicated that they used more than one method of evaluation.

TABLE 3

GRADUATE STUDENT PROGRAM EVALUATION

---

Instruction Format

Please respond to all statements below in reference to the particular department/program/school in which you completed your degree. Place in the space provided the number which best describes your opinion using the following scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = No Opinion
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

---

GRADUATE CURRICULUM:

_____ 1. The majority of courses completed toward my degree were valuable in pursuing my chosen career.
_____ 2. The majority of my WVU courses taken provided indepth study and understanding of my area of study.
_____ 3. Coursework completed at WVU gave me only a narrow perspective of my field.
_____ 4. The courses I wanted to take at WVU were readily available.
_____ 5. Courses at WVU did not adequately prepare me for future employment.
_____ 6. The curriculum of my major department met my needs as a student.
_____ 7. The curriculum at WVU did not meet my expectations of graduate study.
_____ *8. There was freedom in my department to choose the courses to complete.
_____ *9. Requirements for graduation were clearly specified for graduate students in my department.

GRADUATE ADVISING:

_____ 1. My adviser had a thorough knowledge of graduate school policies and procedures.
_____ 2. My adviser's knowledge of my area of study was minimal.
_____ 3. My adviser was not readily available for assistance.
_____ 4. My adviser was helpful to me as a graduate student.
_____ 5. My adviser was supportive of me as an individual.
_____ 6. My adviser was instrumental in helping me obtain a job.
_____ 7. My adviser discouraged a professional attitude and perspective toward my field of study.

TABLE 3 (continued)

WVU FACILITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES:

_____*1. WVU provides an efficient process of registration.
_____ 2. There was an unfair and inequitable administration of graduate policies at WVU.
_____*3. My department/school kept up-to-date graduate student records.
_____*4. Requirements for graduation are clearly presented by the WVU Graduate College.
_____ 5. WVU supports adequate research facilities for graduate students.
_____*6. WVU teaching facilities are adequate.
_____*7. Office facilities for WVU graduate students are substandard.
_____*8. Morgantown & WVU housing for graduate students is adequate.
_____*9. WVU financial assistance for graduate students is inadequate.
_____*10. WVU library facilities in my field are adequate.
_____*11. WVU placement service was helpful to me in obtaining employment.

GRADUATE FACULTY:

_____ 1. The faculty in my department project a professional attitude.
_____ 2. I was dissatisfied with the teaching by WVU faculty.
_____ 3. The faculty in my department demonstrate a limited knowledge of the field.
_____ 4. The WVU faculty demonstrated an up-to-date knowledge of subject matter presented in courses that I completed.
_____ 5. The faculty in my department stimulate an intellectual climate.
_____ 6. WVU faculty do not motivate graduate students.
_____ 7. The faculty in my department stimulate productive student/faculty relations.
_____ 8. The faculty in my department provide frank feedback of my graduate work.
_____ 9. The faculty in my department do not help graduate students.
_____*10. The faculty in my department are productive in conducting research.
_____11. I received critical evaluation of my graduate work at WVU.
_____12 WVU faculty are not receptive to differing opinions and information.
_____13. Assignments given during my graduate work were relevant to advancing my knowledge of the field.
_____14. The faculty in my department were fair in their grading of graduate work.
_____15. The faculty in my department provided adequate direction to complete my degree.

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT:

_____ 1. The overall learning climate at WVU is stimulating.
_____ 2. The atmosphere in my department is more cooperative than competitive.
_____*3. My work at WVU helped me become a better communicator.
_____*4. The social life in Morgantown and at WVU hampers successful graduate study.
_____*5. My personal relationships during graduate study provided a comfortable learning environment.

---

*Eliminated from further use after statistical analyses.

TABLE 4

UNROTATED FACTOR PATTERN OF
GRADUATE STUDENT PROGRAM EVALUATION

| Item** | Loading |
|---|---|
| C1 | .58619* |
| C2 | .60979* |
| C3 | -.63370* |
| C4 | .42450* |
| C5 | -.48746* |
| C6 | .64191* |
| C7 | -.69064* |
| A1 | .54208* |
| A2 | -.52094* |
| A3 | -.45484* |
| A4 | .71020* |
| A5 | .59919* |
| A6 | .46925* |
| A7 | -.46459* |
| FP2 | .41013* |
| FP4 | .39613 |
| FP5 | .42187* |
| FP6 | .32988 |
| FP7 | -.13554 |
| F1 | .65629* |
| F2 | -.64235* |
| F3 | -.69507* |
| F4 | .61446* |
| F5 | .79712* |
| F6 | -.73704* |
| F7 | .76594* |
| F8 | .72815* |
| F9 | -.75914* |
| F11 | .58382* |
| F12 | -.48831* |
| F13 | .70007* |
| F14 | .65434* |
| F15 | .73034* |
| LE1 | .60668* |
| LE2 | .61680* |
| LE3 | .35626 |
| LE4 | -.00020 |
| LE5 | .33297 |

**Items are referenced in Table 3

C = Curriculum
A = Advising
FP = Facilities & Administrative Policies
F = Faculty
LE = Learning Environment